

Ecological Genomics, pt. 1

you, your data, your perception and
the hard realities

Christopher West Wheat



Goal of this lecture

- Present a non-typical view of ecological genomics
- Make you uncomfortable by sharing my nightmares
- Encourage you to critically assess your results in light of publication biases

Disclaimer

I'm a positive person

I like my job and the work we all do

I'm just sharing food for thought

What if

How would that
affect your
expectations?

50% of your
favorite studies
were just
wrong?


Publication replication failures

- Biomedical studies
 - Of 49 most cited clinical studies, 45 showed intervention was effective
 - Most were randomized control studies
 - Of the 34 that were later replicated, 41% were directly contradicted or had much lower effect sizes.
- Mouse cocaine effect replicates in three cities
 - Highly standardized study
 - Average movement was 600 cm, 701 cm, and > 5000 cm in the cities

Lehrer 2010


Ioannidis 2005 *JAMA*

Can publication bias increase effect size?




Decreasing effect size with increasing sample size

correlations between fluctuating asymmetry and individual attractiveness in various studies



Decreasing effect size with increasing replication means what?



Why Most Published Research Findings Are False

A research finding is less likely to be true when:

- ✓ the studies conducted in a field have a small sample size
- ✓ when effect sizes are small
- ✓ when there is a greater number and lesser pre-selection of tested relationships
- ✓ where there is greater flexibility in designs, definitions, outcomes, and analytical modes
- ✓ when there is greater financial and other interest and prejudice
- ✓ when more teams are involved in a scientific field, all chasing after statistical significance by using different tests

There are lies, damn lies, and

Are datasets too big to fail?

What do follow-up studies reveal?

How can we gain confidence in our work?

Outline

- What is the genomic architecture of phenotypes?
- What is the power of molecular tests of selection?
- What does dissection of a classic comparative genomics study reveal?

Non – adaptive




disease, aging, height, etc.



1000's of loci, each of
small effect size

generally ...

Adaptive



salinity, color, resistance, etc.




One or several loci of large
effect

Is this a publication bias?

Will your trait have 1000's of small effect
genes, or a few genes of large effect?

Metabolic Pathways



How do we find the genes that matter?


Publications using molecular tests demonstrate we can sequence our way to answers

Current paradigm:

Sequence, map, find sig. patterns, make causal story, move on


.....

What is the architecture of a causal variant?



How predictable are adaptations?

	Plants	Animals
Coding ¹	71	163
<i>Cis</i> -regulatory	26	48
Other ²	16	7
Total	113	218
Null ³	67	32




	Morphology	Physiology	Behavior
Coding ³	62	170	2
<i>Cis</i> -regulatory	43	29	2
Other ⁴	3	20	0
Total	108	219	4
Null ⁵	41	58	0

How do we find the genes that matter?

- Molecular tests of selection are popular, but ...
 - What are their assumptions and power?
- What are these tests detecting?
 - What is a footprint of selection?
 - How are they formed?
 - How large are they?
 - How long do they last?

Finding the genes: a decision tree



What power do we
have to detect
balancing
selection?



What is
statistical
power?

Power is the probability that the test will reject the
null hypothesis when the alternative hypothesis is
TRUE

Using ANOVA, you want power $> 90\%$ at reasonable
sample size, right?

What power do we have to detect balancing selection?

	Width of window (bp)				
ρ	25	50	100	200	1000
1	85.6	90.2	92.8	93.5	83.8
3	80.8	85.3	86.3	83.5	44.7
10	69.0	69.9	64.5	51.0	4.1
30	48.1	42.5	31.0	15.7	0.1
100	20.5	15.6	8.9	2.4	0.0

Tajima's D
% finding selection of 5000 simulations



- For *Drosophila melanogaster*, power = 50% with window size of 200 bp, using 24 diploid individuals.
- For species with larger population size, power likely lower
- Recombination and gene conversion destroy 'footprint' rather quickly

Directional selection: an example of the expectations of hard selection



- Population genomics has been dominated by developing methods to detect hard sweeps for past two decades
 - But a 'null model' has been elusive

```
A T G G T A G G T C A T A T T G A T C A G G G T G A A T G T G C T A G A A C A T A
A T G C T A G A T C A A A G T G A T C A T G G T G A A T G T G C T A G A A C A T A
A T G G T A G A T C A A A T T G A T C A T G G T G C A T G T G C T A G A T C A T A
A T G C T A G A T C A T A T T G A T G A T G G T G A A T G T G C T A G A T C A T A
A T G C T A G A T C A T A T T G A T C A T G G T G A A T G T G C T T G A A C A T A
A T G C T A G G T C A T A T T G A T C A T G C T G A A A G T G G T A G A T C A T A
```

What is our power to detect hard sweeps?






Sample size (30,000 generations)



When did selection act on your phenotype?

Zhai, Nielsen & Slatkin 2008 MBE

Hard selection case example: threespine stickleback fish



Threespine stickleback fish



(*Gasterosteus aculeatus*)

- Has body armor in the ocean
- Loses almost all armor in lakes

Lakes





Ocean





Parallel adaptation in fresh water lakes via hard sweeps

Marine population




Individual genome sequencing: powerful insights



2-5 X per individual, sliding 2500 bp window, 500 bp step


Jones et al. 2012 Nature

What type genomic regions are selected upon?





Jones et al. 2012 Nature

How common are such hard selective sweeps?





- Does your favorite test for selection rely upon such events?
 - MK-test needs repeated events
 - Fst outlier, EHH, Tajima's D, etc.





High recombination,
Slow fixation




Low recombination,
Fast fixation


Position along chromosome

Barret and Schluter 2008 TREE


Hard vs. soft or incomplete sweeps in populations



What do soft sweeps look like?



How common were hard sweeps in our history?



- “classic sweeps were not a dominant mode of human adaptation over the past 250,000 years”
- “much local adaptation has occurred by selection acting on existing variation rather than new mutation”

1000 Genomes PC 2010 Science
Hernandez et al. 2011 Science

How common are soft sweeps in your species?


Thought experiment:

Do most species respond to selection in the lab? **Yes**

Why? **Because they have existing variation in population**

If populations have variation, is selection likely to act on it? **Yes**

What does this tell us about frequency of soft selection in wild?



What does this
mean for tests
of selection?

Age and type of selection matters

- Novel mutation, large mutation, hard sweep selected to fixation
 - High probability of detection
- Old mutation, polygenetic, soft sweep of incomplete fixation
 - Low probability of detection
- Finding the causal mechanism
 - Coding > expression
 - SNPs > more complex mutations (indel, TE, CNV)
 - Ongoing gene flow, grouping by phenotype across replicate populations helps a lot
- What is the relative frequency of these?
 - What will be the architecture of your phenotype?
 - What does your method have the highest power to detect?




Get ready, here come the 1000ⁿ genomes

- Roughly 20 arthropods sequenced to date
 - plans to sequence 5,000 more
- Many other large scale projects coming online




- Unprecedented data for studying:
 - Phylogenetic relationships
 - Genome evolution
 - Functional insights into genes and genomic features (e.g. regulation and inheritance)

Classic study: Evolution of genes and genomes on the *Drosophila* phylogeny



Drosophila 12 Genomes Consortium 2007 Nature

Tempo and mode of chromosome evolution




- > 20 My, chromosomal order completely reshuffled in Diptera

Drosophila 12 Genomes Consortium 2007 Nature

Genome evolution

Drosophila 12 Genomes Consortium 2007 Nature


	Total no. of protein- coding genes (per cent with <i>D. melanogaster</i> homologue)	Coding sequence/ intron (Mb)
<i>D. melanogaster</i>	13,733 (100%)	38.9/21.8
<i>D. simulans</i>	15,983 (80.0%)	45.8/19.6
<i>D. sechellia</i>	16,884 (81.2%)	47.9/21.9
<i>D. yakuba</i>	16,423 (82.5%)	50.8/22.9
<i>D. erecta</i>	15,324 (86.4%)	49.1/22.0
<i>D. ananassae</i>	15,276 (83.0%)	57.3/22.3
<i>D. pseudoobscura</i>	16,363 (78.2%)	49.7/24.0
<i>D. persimilis</i>	17,325 (72.6%)	54.0/21.9
<i>D. willistoni</i>	15,816 (78.8%)	65.4/23.5
<i>D. virilis</i>	14,680 (82.7%)	57.9/21.7
<i>D. mojavensis</i>	14,849 (80.8%)	57.8/21.9
<i>D. grimshawi</i>	15,270 (81.3%)	54.9/22.5



■ Single-copy orthologues ■ Conserved homologues ■ Patchy homologues (with *mel.*) ■ Patchy homologues (no *mel.*) ■ Lineage specific




Selection dynamics across functional categories



- 33.1% of single-copy orthologues have experienced positive selection on at least a subset of codons.

Gene Family Evolution across 12 Drosophila Genomes

- One fixed gene gain/ loss across the genome every 60,000 yr
- 17 genes are estimated to be duplicated and fixed in a genome every million years



Drosophila 12 Genomes Consortium 2007 Nature
Hahn et al. 2007 Plos Genetics

Comparative Genomics : a house of cards?

- Data scale is too large to thoroughly assess errors ...
 - Its likely 50% of what you think you know is wrong (it's true for me)
 - What is reality?
- All conclusions, at some stage, rest upon
 - Simple bioinformatics
 - Assumptions that get incorporated into seemingly unbiased methods
- Exploring two pillars of this paper, their error and repercussions
 - Gene alignments in detecting positive selection
 - Calibrations in temporal analysis




Established studies allow ...

Follow up studies to reveal limitations

Robust findings to emerge with age


Inferring selection dynamics:



33.1% of single-copy orthologues have experienced positive selection on at least a subset of codons.

How robust are these conclusions?


Codon based tests of selection



d_N / d_S
ratio

> 1 positive sel.
= 1 neutral
< 1 purifying sel.


Classic study: Evolution of genes and genomes on the *Drosophila* phylogeny



Drosophila 12 Genomes Consortium 2007 Nature


dN/dS estimates by aligner

- 6690 orthologs
- 5 alignment methods
- Little agreement of the different dN/dS estimates




Comparing results across methods is responsible bioinformatics!!!!

Since we can't look at our data, we need approaches that
allow 1st principal assessments



Alignment has larger effect than biology

- Number of significant genes in common across 1, 2, 3, 4, or all 5 of the alignment methods



- Two alignment results
 - Top (Tcoffee) with 3 site sel. sites
 - Bottom (ProbCons) indicates region has a 60% alignment probability


Temporal inference:


fact or fiction?



Timing of divergence

- Directly affects rate estimates
- Deriving unbiased dates from molecular data
 - Large field of software development
- Bayesian methods, while potentially informative and unbiased
 - Can be easily, and are routinely, abused







Divergence of two Hawaiian species, and Kauai age of 5.1 my

1. No phylogeny
2. Fixed clock rate
3. Between 3 – 64 genes in pairwise comparisons

Temporal patterns in fruitflies
(Tamura et al. 2004 MBE)



Classic study: Evolution of genes and genomes on the *Drosophila* phylogeny




Drosophila 12 Genomes Consortium 2007 Nature





- **Drosophila clade**
 - Schizophora constrained to maximum of 70 Ma
 - Without constraint, goes to 115 Ma

What's reality?



Episodic radiations in the fly tree of life
(Wiegmann et al. 2011 PNAS)

Determining objective priors is challenging



Priors in Bayesian rel. clock analysis:

Mu = lab observed mutation rate


A1,2 = geological calibration, small Ne

C1,2 = geological calibration, large Ne

1 vs 2 = mean rate differences


Obbard et al. 2012 Mol. Biol. Evol.

Priors directly influence posteriors



Prior distributions matter

- Integrative science is challenging
- Discuss or collaborate with experts to evaluate your approach.



How do we gain dating confidence when we are in the dark?

- Fossils and DNA are likely to rarely agree
- How can we assess the temporal signal in the DNA in a robust manner?
 - Reducing prior biases and using lots of DNA data, while modeling likely violations of analysis models



Wheat and Wahlberg 2013
Trends Ecology & Evolution

Microevolution effects


Previous examples were at deep evolutionary time scales

Surely such problems don't exist at the within genera level Right?

Recombination violates dN/dS tests


Codeml
inferred
selection:

False
positives can
increase to
over 30%



- 13% of sites simulated at $\omega = 2.5$
- Sample size = 30 sequences


Posterior distribution estimates of substitution rates from mitochondrial control region from Beringian bison



Ho et al. 2007 Systematic Biology

Time dependent rates of molecular evolution

Significant implications for phylogeographic studies that use fixed rates to assess demographic with environmental change



Post-genomics challenge


“What we can measure is by definition uninteresting and what we are interested in is by definition unmeasurable”

- Lewontin 1974

“What we can assemble in the genome may, by definition, be uninteresting and what we are interested in is by definition very difficult to sequence and assemble and annotate and estimate”

- indels & inversions**
- gene family dynamics**
- demographic and selection dynamics**
- temporal estimates**

What does a
good
P-value
really tell
you?




Type of
selection?

Have you been
chasing a good
P-value?


Method
mismatched
to
mechanism?

Age of
selection
event?



What does a
bad
P-value
really tell
you?

Significant P-values



Robust understanding requires validation:

- Genetic manipulation
- Field study manipulations

Goal of this lecture

- Present a non-typical view of ecological genomics
 - So you have a more complete view of the field
- Make you uncomfortable
 - Provide a context for understanding your results
- Encourage you to rethink the reality presented by publication biases
 - Overcoming this bias is a continual challenge

... and now for pt. 2



Stockholm
University